## The Cochin Payment of Salaries and Allowances Act (Amendment) Bill

**Mr. A. V. Moothedan** *(Chalakkudi):* Sir, I move that the Cochin Payment of Salaries and Allowances Act (Amendment) Bill be taken up and finally passed.

**Mr. K. R. Viswambharan** *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli):* I second it.

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters):* I oppose it.

**Mr. A. V. Moothedan** *(Chalakkudi):* In that case, I wish to say a few words. This is the third stage of the Bill and on previous occasions we had very interesting and vigorous speeches delivered. All the principles have been discussed thread-bare. And I thought that no speech would be necessary at this stage. But since my Hon'ble Friend Mr. Mathai is bent upon opposing this measure, I wish to say one or two words. Payment of Salaries to legislators is not a new principle at all. When we advocate the cause of parliamentary democracy, it follows that we should support some payment to the legislators for their maintenance. If you examine the British constitutional history, it will be found that the Members of the House of Commons used to be paid from very early days. I shall read here one passage from May's Parliamentary Practice, page 23.

"Constituencies were liable from the earliest times for the expense of maintaining their members during their attendance upon Parliament. This liability was fixed in 1323 at 4 sh. a day for a knight of the shire and..... The practice had disappeared by the beginning of the 17th century save in a few isolated cases but the legal liability of the costituencies for these payments to their members has never been removed.

In the 19th century there was a movement in favour of the payment of members out of national funds. A provision to that effect was included in the Reform Bill introduced by Lord Blandford in 1830 and formed one of the items of the peoples Charter presented to the House of Commons in 1839. Motions in favour of the proposal were brought before the House of Commons in 1888, 1892, and 1893 and in 1895 a resolution in favour of the payment of a reasonable allowance to members was agreed to. In 1911 the expediency of paying a salary of 400 pounds a year to members who were not in receipt of salaries as ministers, Officers of the House or Officers of His Majestry's household was put to the test of the opinion of the House of Commons by a motion made by a member of the Government."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

So, 1911 is a land-mark in the history of British Parliament and from that date members used to be paid £400 p.a. In this connection I wish to read one passage from Asquith's History of Parliaments:—

"On the same day, (August 10) on which the opposition to the Parliament Bill finally collapsed in the House of Lords a resolution for the payment of a salary of £400 a year to all non-official members of the House of Commons was moved on behalf of the Government by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lloyd George. Mr. Lee brought forward an amendment on behalf of the Official opposition declaring that any such payment would be "an indefensible violation of the principle of gratuitous public service." The same principle is advocated by my friend Mr. Mathai.

That is the position in Parliament. Since then, the salary has been increased from ttime to time andat present it is £600 p. a. Besides that, the Leader of he Opposition is paid £2000. The Ministers are getting £6000. That is the position in England. There, the number of members is 615 and the quorum is 45. There have been instances where for want of quorum the Parliament had to be dissolved.

**Mr. K. R. Viswambharan** *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli):* Are we not much more dutiful?

**Mr. A. V. Moothedan** *(Chalakkudi):* Yes. We had no occasion to dissolve the Council for want of quorum.

Now, coming nearer home, in India, before the Government of India Act, 1935, there was no question of payment at all. With the inauguration of Provincial autonomy in 1937 and the Congrees Party coming into power, they thought that it was quite necessary that the practice of voluntary public service should give way for payment to the members of allowances for their services, in all the Provinces. In Congress Provinces, it is Rs. 75 p.m. and in Bengal and Punjab, it is fixed at Rs. 150. Therefore, that is the position in British India. In Cochin State, after considering all the aspects of the matter, we have fixed a reasonable allowance of Rs. 50 per mensem. I think, it is not at all unreasonable that the members of this House should be paid Rs. 50 for their work as Legislative Council Members. It may be argued that the Council work is only for 26 days in a year. In addition to attending Council meetings, there are so many other duties we are called upon to discharge. We have to visit our constituencies, we have to meet the Diwan and make representations, we have to meet the Hon'ble Minister and make representations and also the several Heads of Departments. All these things we have to do. And then, we are members of so many Committees of this House and



LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

other Committees. Considering all these, we have fixed a small allowance of Rs. 50. I think, the House will agree with the proposition.

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters):* Sir, I rise to oppose the motion. I had the misfortune to oppose it ever since it came here. I may assure this House that I do it with malice to none and charity to all.

**Mr. President :** Payment to none and charity to all. *(Laughter).*

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters):* A very virulent criticism was thrown upon me by the present Leader of the Progressive Party that the dignity of the House has been lost, because I opposed this Bill.

**Mr. M. K. Devassy** *(Adur):* If you read your last speech in this House everybody will be convinced of the statement.

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters):* I say, no dignity has been lost, as has been remarked by Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar, the former Leader of the Party who then led the Party by the nose and who now leads it by the tail. *(Laughter).* I oppose this measure on 5 substantial grounds.

**Mr. K. R. Viswambharan** *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli):* Formerly it was seven.

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters):* There are 12 grounds; but since it is the third reading I will refer to five only. When arguments fail you throw contumely upon me. In the first place, the two grounds raised by the hon'ble mover are beside the point. He made a comparison between the House of Commons and the Cochin Legislative Council. It is clear that the comparison holds good not even for a moment. The work there is so arduous and continuous and so responsible,—I am saying this with a full sense of responsibility—that there is no sort of comparison between the House of Commons and the Cochin Legislative Council. Secondly, he advocated the ground of work done for the public by the Council members. He conceded that we sit here for 26 days only and at the same time he stated that though we sit for 26 days only we have to go to the Diwan's Bungalow for submitting petitions and leading deputations and that we have to go to the constituency to understand the grievance of the people. Even if that were so, that would be no argument for demanding Rs. 600 for a year for 26 days' visible work. As regards the work we actually do, it can have no comparison with that done in the House of Commons. For instance, the House of Commons sits far into night. Further, our State is so small that there will be no possibility of dislocation of work for anybody. Most

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of the members are lawyers and except for 5 days in a term no other day is lost. If there is some loss, there is the possibility of gain also in other ways. As regards any other business man, I assert, it would be easy for him to return to his place every day, the distance from the various parts being very small. Nobody can therefore argue that there will be dislocation of work. Thirdly, the expenditure involved will be incomparably too great. Since responsible government is asked for, a number of ministers will be appointed and therefore, the cost of responsible government will be tremendously high even without this. 46 elected members will have to be paid at the rate Rs. 50 a month. Though the calculation is easy, it is necessary to say that it means a monthly expenditure of Rs. 2,300. The only difference will be the difference between the third class allowance and the first class allowance which is given to the members, and our Finance Member has stated that the total amount will be Rs. 22,000. That I consider to be too big an expenditure. We have to add the possible salary of one or two Ministers more, if they also come. So, the cost of responsible government may even be Rs. 60,000, that is Rs. 5,000 per month which I consider to be too much. Then, we have to consider that in the land of Cochin Rs. 50 is too big for a part-time officer. Men of our education, calibre and standing are really working for less than Rs. 50. They are doing work from 11 to 5 and even later if his chief wants them. What I only mean is that Rs. 50 for part-time work is tremendously great. Take the case of Registrars. They get only Rs. 60. Again, there are very many honorary officers without any salary. Take the Honorary Surgeons. An M. B. B. S. doctor can be compared to a B. A. and B. L., other things being equal. There is another principle involved in this. Are we the only honorary men working in the State? Then what about the members of the Municipal Council? What about the Panchayat members and Presidents? The Panchayat judges must have to meet once in a week. If we are given an allowance of Rs. 50, how can we refuse an allowance to the Panchayat judges when they ask for an allowance? When there are a number of other honorary officers working for nothing, we cannot ask for an allowance. There is the question of principle also. As it is, we seek elections, at tremendous cost for the glory of working honorarily for our countrymen. Subsequently, having come to the Council, we should not turn down and say that we must be paid an allowance. I must also say that there are no rules governing the conduct and work of the members. There are absolutely no rules. You cannot make a comparison with the House of Commons. Suppose members having been allowed salaries do not attend the Council. We know there are silent

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

members and absentee members. How can we enforce any rules? That will be infringing upon the responsibility of the members. If comparisons are drawn from other parts I may also draw comparison. No salary is given in Travancore or Mysore or for that matter in any other State, the reason being that since no full responsible government has been given the work is evidently very little. And the last argument was that we are spending a lot of money on elections. Nobody asks you to do so. Do you mean to say that this Rs. 600 will be sufficient for all the expenditure incurred in elections and other subsequent expenditure? I can immediately tell you that the expenditure will be increased. Instead of people spending Rs. 5,000 they will spend another 2,000 in the hope of being compensated by the salary. These are no arguments. I, therefore, for these reasons and others, which I once touched upon, oppose the Bill.

*Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Mulakunnathukavu):* Mr. President, I feel personally that this House will not be justified in passing this measure. The House sits only 26 days in a year. The members of such a House will not be justified in requesting the Government to pay them a salary of Rs. 50. My Honourable Friend from Chalakkudi compared conditions obtaining in the provincial legislatures in India after the inauguration of the Government of India Act. But even now, I believe, the members of the Central Assembly and the Council of State are not paid salary. I should think the reason why the members of the Provincial Assembly after the inauguration of provincial autonomy are paid a salary must be this. So long as the legislature is completely responsible for running the government of the country, the members of the legislature may be justified in demanding a salary. But when the government of the country either under law or practice is not vested in the legislature, the legislature would not be justified in demanding a salary. Therefore, I think it will be infringing the dignity of this House to request the Government or to pass a Bill demanding salary for the members of this House. The conditions in the British Houses of Parliament and any other legislatures which have got real sovereign power are so different from that of this legislature that I do not think it is necessary to dwell upon these matters. Therefore, I am constrained to oppose this measure.

In passing, I feel there is one justification and that justification has not been referred to by any of the members. There are the Government officers, who are drawing fat salaries, and much as we would wish it, we cannot reduce their pay and take a single pie out

*Speech not corrected by the hon'ble member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of it. In order to compensate that inability perhaps we may be justified, because we cannot reduce their salary and because we cannot do anything to control or regulate their salaries. That alone is the justification I can find for the Bill. But that justification has not been referred to. On that ground alone I am not going to support this Bill. Therefore, I feel that I should oppose this Bill.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നു. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ചാലക്കുടി മെമ്പർ പറയിച്ച വിവരണങ്ങൾ മാത്രം എടുത്താൽ മതി ഈ ബില്ലിനെതിരായി പറഞ്ഞ ന്യായങ്ങളെല്ലാം അബദ്ധമെന്ന മനസ്സിലാക്കുവാൻ. അനേക സെഞ്ചുറീസ് പാർലിമെന്റ് മെമ്പർ വാങ്ങാതെ ജോലി നടത്തി. പതിനൊന്നു കൊല്ലമായി അവിടെ സാലറി നടപ്പാക്കീട്ട്. ഈ ഫ്രഞ്ച് കൊല്ലം മുമ്പുള്ള ഏതാനും നൂറാണ്ടിലും അതിനു ശേഷവും പാർലിമെന്റിനു അവിടെ ഒരു മാറ്റവും വന്നിട്ടില്ല. അപ്പോൾ മെമ്പർ കൊടുത്താൽ കൂടുതൽ പ്രയോജനമുണ്ടാകുമെന്നുള്ള ബോദ്ധ്യം കൊണ്ടു മാത്രമാണ് അവിടെ മെമ്പർ നടപ്പാക്കിയതു്. ആ പരിഷ്കാരം പകർന്നാൽപാർലിമെന്റ് മെമ്പർ മില്ലാതെ കഴിച്ചിടത്തോളം കാലം കഴിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. ബ്രിട്ടീഷിന്ത്യയിൽ സംസ്ഥാന നിയമസഭകൾ ഉടനെ അതുപകർന്നു വന്ന ദിവസമേ ഇവിടെ ജോലിയുള്ള എന്നു് മുളകുന്നതുകാവ് മെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞതിൽ ഞാൻ അത്ഭുതപ്പെടുന്നു. നമ്മുടെ ജോലി ഇവിടെ മാത്രമല്ല ഉള്ളതു്. ഈ കൌൺസിൽ മെമ്പർമാർക്ക് ഒരു രൂപാ കൊടുക്കുന്നതു് ഇവിടേയുള്ള വേലക്കു മാത്രമല്ല. ഈ നിയമസഭയിലെ വേല ശരിക്കു ചെയ്യുവുന്നവർക്കു വളരെയെല്ലാം ചെയ്യാനുണ്ടു്. ചില ആളുകൾ അതു ശരിക്കു ചെയ്യില്ലെന്നു വരാം. ഇവിടെയുള്ള മെമ്പന്മാരിൽ ഫ ഠ പേരെയെങ്കിലും ഇങ്ങനെ ശമ്പളം കൊടുക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു് നല്ലപോലെ വേല ചെയ്യിക്കാൻ സാധിച്ചാൽ മറവുള്ളവർ പണിയെടുത്തില്ലെങ്കിലും അതു വളരെ ഉപകാരപ്പെടും. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഈ ബിൽ ഇവിടെ പാസ്സാക്കണം. ശമ്പളം വാങ്ങുന്ന ശവമ്മെണ്ടുദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ തന്നെ എല്ലാവരും ശരിക്കു പണിയെടുക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ? ചില ആളുകൾ ശരിക്കു പണിയെടുക്കും. ചില ആളുകൾ ശരിക്കു പണിയെടുത്തില്ലെന്നു വരാം. ശമ്പളം വാങ്ങി ഉറക്കം തൂങ്ങുന്ന എത്ര ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ ഇവിടെയുണ്ടു്! അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർക്ക് ശമ്പളം കൊടുക്കാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നു വെച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ? പിന്നെ ഇതിനെ എതുത്തു കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ നല്ല പേർ കിട്ടുമെന്നുള്ളവർ അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്തുകൊള്ളട്ടെ. പാർലിമെന്റ് മെമ്പന്മാർക്കു ശമ്പളം കൊടുക്കുന്നതു് ജോലി നോക്കീട്ടൊ, അവിടത്തെ ജോലി അവരുടെ മറ്റു ജോലികൾക്കു പ്രതിബന്ധമാകുമെന്നു കരുതീട്ടോ അല്ല. തക്കതായ ഒരു ന്യായവും ശവമ്മെണ്ടിനെ, ഇങ്ങിനെ എതുത്ത മെമ്പന്മാർക്കൊ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ എതുക്കുന്നതിനു പറയാനുണ്ടാകയില്ല. ഇതുകൊണ്ടു് വളരെ പ്രയോജനമുണ്ടാകുമെന്നു് എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നുണ്ടു്. ഈ രൂപാ വീതം മെമ്പർമാർക്കു കൊടുക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ചെയ്യുന്നതിനേക്കാൾ കൂടുതൽ പ്രയോജനകരമായ നിലയിൽ ഈ നിയമസഭയിലെ വേലകൾ അവർ നിർവ്വഹിക്കും. നിയമസഭയിലെ വേലയെന്നു പറഞ്ഞാൽ, ശരിക്കു ചെയ്യുന്നവർക്കു ഒരു ദിവസവും കിട്ടാത്ത മാതിരി ചെയ്യാനുണ്ടാവും. സംഗതികൾ നല്ലപോലെ പഠിച്ചു ചോദ്യങ്ങൾ ചോദിക്കുന്നതിനും നിശ്ചയങ്ങൾ അയയ്ക്കുന്നതിനും മറ്റും ധാരാളം സമയം വേണം. വേലയും ചെയ്യണം. ഇങ്ങനെ വേല ചെയ്യുവാൻ ഇവിട

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ത്തെ മെമ്പന്മാർക്ക് ഇ ഠ ശ്രമം വീതം പ്രതിമാസം കൊടുക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലാ ത്ത വിധം അത്ര മോശമാണ് കൊച്ചി രാജ്യത്തെ സാമ്പത്തികസ്ഥിതിയെ ന്ന ശവമ്മെണ്ടു പറഞ്ഞാൽ ഞാൻ സമ്മതിക്കുകയില്ല. ആ പണം ശവമ്മെ ണ്ടു കാണണം. അതിനു ശവമ്മെണ്ടുദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ ശമ്പളം വെട്ടിക്കുറക്ക ണമെന്നു ഞാൻ പറയുന്നില്ല. ഈ ബില്ലിനെ താങ്ങിയാൽ ശവമ്മെണ്ടു" തെറിഞ്ഞുപോകുമെന്നോ, ജനങ്ങൾ തെറിഞ്ഞുപോകുമെന്നോ അവരവരുടെ ആ ത്മാർത്ഥതയിൽ വിശ്വാസമുള്ളവർ ഭയപ്പെടുകയില്ല. ഒരു നല്ല ബില്ലാണ് കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്നതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി അതിനെ അനു കൂലിക്കുന്നു.

**Mr. M. K. Devassy** *(Adur):* Sir, I rise to support this Bill and I do so without any false pride whatsoever. The Bill was discussed at length last time and I was not surprised to hear my Hon'ble Friend Mr. V. J. Mathai opposing the Bill, because he had opposed it from the start. But I am only sorry to find him importing the atmosphere of last time's discussion to this session also. I only wish to render an explanation for the charges. If I had answered my friend on that day in as vehement a manner as I can it was only to defend the honour and dignity of the House against the scathing attacks by my friend. I could not bear the statements made by him on that day when he castigated the character of the House as irresponsible and as people who never care for the work. It is only when such imputations were thrown upon the non-official members of the House, though as a non-official, I thought it was only proper on my part to answer the charges and I would repeat it if necessary. I am but a little surprised when I find opposition coming from the expected quarters. Last time, when the Bill was introduced, I found Mr. Salem supporting the Bill, and we thought that the Cochin Congress was for the Bill. I was, therefore, surprised when I heard the Secretary of the Cochin Congress Party so ably opposing the Bill now.

**Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri):* It is only in his personal capacity.

**Mr. M. K. Devassy** *(Adur):* Since this opposition is based upon a very important argument I thought it was my duty to answer him. I could not possibly expect my friend who is a staunch congressman to oppose the measure of paying the legislature, a policy already accepted by the Congress Government in the Provincial legislatures. The reason of the distinction that he wishes to draw between that system and this is that there is responsible government there and that there is no full responsible government here, and that therefore, they will be justified in drawing a salary and we will not be. I think, my friend is labouring under a mis-apprehension. The duty of the non-official side when there is no responsible government is

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

greater than the duty of the non-officials when there is responsible government. As has been correctly put by my friend Mr. Salem we are the watch-dogs of the administration, and it is our duty to examine, scrutinise and criticise the Government in spite of displeasures we may have to invite in that connection. This duty is greater when there is no responsible government than when there is responsible government. This House should not be under the impression that the work of the non-officials will be lightened because there is no responsible government. Our work is greater.

**Mr. P. Govinda Menon** *(Mulakunnathukavu):* The distinction that I wished to draw was this. When the government is run by the legislature as in the Madras Presidency there may be some justification. But here the Government is not run by the legislature. Without the legislature the government may not go on for a single day there.

**Mr. M. K. Devassy** *(Adur):* If the running of Government imposes greater duties, I understand your argument in not demanding for a salary. But greater duties are not imposed upon the legislature. I wish to say that this argument is absolutely not of any avail and the same principles that guided the Indian National Congress in Madras should be adopted here. For the same reasons or different reasons the legislature will be justified in demanding a salary. My friend, Mr. Mathai, has been drawing the comparison between the honorary work of legislators and others. I fail to understand how that comparison will stand? There are many people rendering honorary service. But the difference is we work in a legislature and its effect will reflect upon the country as a whole. A doctor may serve any number of patients but its effect is limited to that sphere. It does not go to anywhere else. If in this House a member acts responsibly, the effect of his action will reflect upon the whole country. If a member of the legislature in discharging his responsibilities properly is given proper facilities you are thereby fulfilling the only method of helping the administration of the State, and that in the wider interests of the public.

**Mr. P. Govinda Menon** *(Mulakunnathukavu):* What about the Panchayats?

**Mr. M. K. Devassy** *(Adur):* It is always a matter of gradation. The Legislative Council is higher than the Panchayats. If the claim of the Panchayat comes in course of time and if their case demands consideration, Government should not shirk their responsibility. The discharge of duties of public representatives is greater than others. For these reasons, I support this Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

**Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar** *(Nemmara):* Sir, I wish to contribute a word to this discussion. The argument of my friend Mr. P. Govinda Menon when the leader of my party was speaking was that in British India the legislature is running the government and therefore, they should be given salaries. This comes as a surprise to me. Even here, so far as certain departments are concerned, in the sense in which he uses it, the legislature is running the government. A part of the Government is run by the Minister who is responsible to the legislature and he, as the executive officer responsible to the House, is running that part of the Government.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. വി. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ : എനിക്ക് അവർക്ക് മാത്രമേ ശമ്പളം കൊടുക്കുവാൻ പാടുള്ളൂ. (ചിരി).

**Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar** *(Nemmara):* Please move an amendment. Another point raised by my friend, the Member for Mulakunnathukavu, was that though Provincial Governments were giving salaries to members in the Central Assembly, no salary is given. Section 29 of the Government of India Act says that members of either Chamber shall be entitled to receive such salary or allowance as may be fixed from time to time by an Act of the Federal Legislature.

**Mr. P. Govinda Menon** *(Mulakunnathukavu):* I refer to the present legislature. That reference is to the Federal Legislature.

**Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar** *(Nemmara) :* The Government of Cochin Act came into being after the Government of India Act of 1935. Now, salary came to be given to the members of the Provincial Legislatures only under the Government of India Act of 1935 and provision regarding the salary to the members of the Central Legislature would have also been made in the Act, but for the delay in the inauguration of the Federation.

**Mr. P. Govinda Menon** *(Mulakunnathukavu):* The point is whether a consultative body like the present Central Legislature is paid salary or not.

**Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar** *(Nemmara):* Even the Central Assembly contemplated in the Act of 1935 is only a consultative body in the sense in which the hon'ble member uses it. I may say for the information of the House and also for the information of the hon'ble member that complete autonomy is not vested in the Central Legislature under the Government of India Act of 1935 so much so the constitution of the Central Government under the Government of India Act is more or less a form of dyarchy. So, I say, the argument advanced by my friend the Hon'ble Member for

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mulakunnathukavu falls flat and is opposed to the provisions of the Act of 1935. These are the only points that have been raised. On the general merits of the Bill, we have had enough of it. I do not wish to speak anything on personal matters. But the principle of payment of salary to the members of legislature had been, as was once pointed out by me in the earlier discussions on this Bill, one of the planks of the Labour Party from very early times and even an ultra-socialist as Mr. Bernard Shaw advocates it. He insists that payment of salary to the members of the legislature is a necessity for the proper working of the legislature. On these grounds, I support the Bill.

**Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri):* Sir, I do not wish to make a speech, because everything that has to be said for and against the Bill has been said. It was a mistake on the part of the mover of the Bill to have made a speech at all and to have provoked all this discussion. That is my earnest belief. Money is a very good thing *(Laughter)*. Good people should get good money. The love of money is very bad and those who do not want money need not take it. This is all I have to say. I support this Bill whole-heartedly for the reasons that have been very well set forth by the Hon'ble the Deputy President.

Of course, I think, I can tear to pieces thread-bare the arguments advanced by the Hon'ble Member for Planters, because there is no stuff in it. Every sentence can be analysed and can be shorn thread-bare. But I do not wish to do it now. I only ask the hon'ble members to support a good thing that is coming to us whole-heartedly.

**Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon** *(Cranganur):* Sir, I oppose the Bill. I am opposing the Bill not because the members of the legislature ought not to be paid or that they have not enough of work. But I am opposing it on financial grounds *(Laughter)*. In spite of the fairly vociferous laughter of the Hon'ble Member for Chalakkudi, I am justified in saying that we cannot afford to spend more money on a legislature of this kind, especially because of the war conditions and the general fall in the Customs Revenue and also because there is a possibility of the war lasting for some time more. It will be impossible for this Government to meet the requirements with the available resources. I also object to the arguments advanced by my Hon'ble Friend, the Member for Mulakunnathukavu *i.e.*, the ground of justification of the division of spoils. If it is a question of division of spoils, I say, it is highly immodest to ask for Rs. 50. Ask for something decent. Why become a super-peon when you can afford to be a Head of Department? If we have got enough funds

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

at our disposal, I think, the Government will find its way to allow the Bill to come into effect. Therefore, my submission to this House is an additional expenditure of nearly Rs. 40,000.....

**Mr. A. V. Moothedan** *(Chalakkudi):* The Government itself has admitted that the additional expenditure will be only Rs. 22,000.

**Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon** *(Cranganur):* Even if it is Rs. 22,000 increased expenditure is absolutely unwarranted, especially in view of the fact that far more liberal allotments are now necessary for famine relief works all over the land. I, therefore, oppose the Bill thoroughly and whole-heartedly.

* മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ: സർ, കൊൺസിൽ മെമ്പർമാക്ക് ഒന്നു ദിവസത്തെ ജോലിമാത്രമേ ഉള്ളൂ എന്നും മറ്റും ചില ആക്ഷേപങ്ങൾ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട പ്ലാന്റേഴ്സ് മെമ്പർ പറയുന്നതു കേട്ടു. അതിനെന്തായിരിക്കും കാരണമെന്നു ഞാനാലോചിച്ചുപ്പോൾ ഇരുപതോ, ഇരുപത്തഞ്ചോ വോട്ടർമാർ മാത്രമടങ്ങിയ ഒരു നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കുന്നതു കൊണ്ടോ അതല്ലെങ്കിൽ ആ നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തിലേക്കു ഇനി പോകേണ്ട എന്നുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശം കൊണ്ടോ ആയിരിക്കാമെന്നാണു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നതു്. ഒരു നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിച്ചു് രണ്ടാമതും ആ നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തിൽ നിന്നും വരണമെന്നുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അയാൾക്കു് എത്ര ജോലിയുണ്ടെന്നുള്ളതു് അഞ്ചു തവണ ഒരേ നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തിൽ നിന്നു വന്നിരിക്കുന്ന എനിക്കറിയാം. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ അനാദരവുപ്പിക കൊടുത്താൽ പോര, വളരെ മെമ്പർമാർ ഉള്ളതു കൊണ്ടു അനാദരവുപ്പിക കൊടുത്താൽ മതിയെന്നു പറയുകയാണു്.

ഒരു പ്രധാന അപേക്ഷ കൂടി എനിക്കുണ്ടു്. ഒരു നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തെ തന്നെ ഞാൻ പതിനാറു കൊല്ലമായി പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കുന്നുണ്ടു്. പതിനേഴാമത്തെ കൊല്ലമാണിതു്. എനിക്കു് അമ്പത്തഞ്ചു വയസ്സും ആയിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള മെമ്പർമാക്ക് ഒരു പെൻഷ്യൻകൂടി അനുവദിച്ചു തന്നാൽ കൊള്ളാമെന്നപേക്ഷയുണ്ടു് (ചിരി).

മിസ്റ്റർ ഇസ്മായിൽഹാജി ഇബ്രാഹിംസേട്ട്: മിസ്റ്റർ പ്രസിഡണ്ടു്, സർ, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ചാലക്കുടി മെമ്പർ ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്ന ബില്ലിനെ ഞാൻ സപ്പോർട്ടുചെയ്യുന്നു. ഇതു് ഈ ബില്ലിന്റെ മൂന്നാമത്തെ വായനയാണു്. ഇപ്പോൾ ബില്ലിന്റെ തത്വത്തെക്കുറിച്ചു് ആവർത്തിച്ചു് ഒരു പ്രസംഗം ചെയ്യേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. വീണ്ടും ഇതിന്റെ തത്വത്തെ ആസ്പദമാക്കി ചിലർ സപ്പോർട്ടു് ചെയ്യുകയും ചിലർ എതിർക്കുകയും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതിൽ ചിലർ ഇതിൽ പെൻഷൻ കൂടി കിട്ടിയാൽകൊള്ളാമെന്നും പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇങ്ങിനെ മൂന്നു നാലു തരത്തിലാണു് ഇതിന്റെ പോക്കു കാണുന്നതു്. ഏതു തരത്തിലായാലും പാസ്സാക്കുന്നതു കൊല്ലമായി പാർലിമെൻറിൽ ചെയ്യപോരുന്ന ഒരു രീതിയാണിതു്. പാർലിമെൻറിൽ പാസാകുന്ന വിഷയങ്ങളെ ആസ്പദമാക്കി പല നിയമങ്ങളും ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവന്നു വാദപ്രതിവാദം

* Speech not corrected by the hon'ble member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

നടത്തി പാസാക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. അക്കൂട്ടത്തിൽ ഈ തിനെക്കുറിച്ച് ആലോചിച്ചാൽ ഇതു ഇവിടെ പാസാക്കാമെന്നാണു് ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നതു്. ഇതു ഒരു ശമ്പളമല്ല. അവർ ചെയ്യുന്ന വക്കിന്നു ഒരു ആണറി അലവൻസായിട്ടു മാത്രമെ ഇതു കണക്കാക്കേണ്ടതുള്ളു. ഇപ്പോൾ മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റിയിലെ ചെയർമാനു് 150 രൂ. മാസംപ്രതി അലവൻസായി കൊടുത്തുവരുന്നുണ്ടു്. അതു കിട്ടുമെന്നു വിചാരിച്ചിട്ടാണോ ചെയർമാന്മാരാകുന്നതു്? അല്ല. അതിന്റെ റസ്പക്ടിനു വേണ്ടിയാണു് ഇങ്ങിനെ ശമ്പളം കൊടുത്തുപോരുന്നതു്. ഇതിനു കൂടുതലായ ഒരു പ്രസംഗത്തിന്റെ ആവശ്യമില്ല. ബില്ലിനെ ഞാൻ ബലമായി അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

*Motion put and carried, 23 for and 4 against*

**Mr. President:** The House will now resume discussion on the motion of Mr. C. V. Iyyu that the Cochin Tenancy Act (Amendment) Bill be taken into consideration.

## The Cochin Tenancy Act (Amendment) Bill*

മിസ്റ്റർ സി. വി. ഇയ്യു: സർ, സെലക്ട് കമ്മിറ്റി റിപ്പോർട്ടിൽതന്നെ മിച്ചവാരവും സർക്കാർ നികുതിയും വെവ്വേറെയാണെന്നു പുരാംവകുപ്പ് പുരം വിവരണത്തിനു താഴെയുള്ള വകുപ്പുകൊണ്ടു കാണാം. ഛാത്തവകാശം എന്താണു് കാണുന്നതിന്റെ അഞ്ചു ശതമാനം വീതം ആക്കേണ്ടതാണെന്ന ഉദ്ദേശം ഈ നടത്തെ നിയമസഭക്കു ബിൽ നിമ്മിച്ച കാലത്തു ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നുവെന്നു ആ ബില്ലിൽതന്നെ—ഫ്രഫസ്മൽ ഭേദഗതിചെയ്ത ബില്ലിൽതന്നെ—പല സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലും ഉള്ള വിവരണങ്ങൾകൊണ്ടു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നുണ്ടു്. പുരം വകുപ്പു് (ഇ) ഉപവകുപ്പിൽ—"the renewal fee, if any, levied and in case no such fee was levied, a statement to that effect" എന്നു തിരിച്ചു പറയുന്നുണ്ടു്. എന്നതന്നെയല്ല പുരം വകുപ്പു് (എ) (ബി) ഉപവകുപ്പുകളിൽ

(a) "all arrears of *michavaram* and *puravaka* dues accruing for a period not exceeding 12 years;

(b) all arrears of Government or local taxes and other dues which he was bound to pay but which were paid by the landlord irrespective of the time when they were paid"

എന്നു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതിൽനിന്നും മിച്ചവാരത്തിൽ സർക്കാർനികുതി ഉൾപ്പെട്ടതല്ലെന്നു നിയമകർത്താക്കൾക്കു് ഉദ്ദേശമുണ്ടായിരുന്നുവെന്നു തെളിയുന്നുണ്ടു്. മിച്ചവാരത്തിന്റെ വിവരണത്തിലുള്ള പിശകു് എങ്ങിനെയോ കടന്നുകൂടിയ ഒരു ചില്ലറ തെറ്റല്ലാതെ വേറെ യാതൊന്നുമല്ല. അയതു ഏതു വിധത്തിലുള്ളതായാലും ഭേദഗതി ചെയ്യുന്നതു്യാവശ്യമായിരിക്കുന്നു. ഒടുവിലത്തെ വകുപ്പിൽ "Arrears of *pattam*, *michavaram*, renewal fee and other dues owing to the landlord as well as arrears of revenue or other

*Appendix

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly